



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,641	04/12/2004	Kimmo Hamynen	NOKM.092PA	1940
76385 7590 09/10/2009 Hollingsworth & Funk 8500 Normandale Lake Blvd., Suite 320 Minneapolis, MN 55437				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, HARESH N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2454				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/10/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10822641	4/12/04	HAMYNEN ET AL.	NOKM.092PA

## EXAMINER

HARESH N. PATEL

ART UNIT	PAPER
2454	20090902

DATE MAILED:

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

## Commissioner for Patents

The reply filed 5/14/2009 is not fully responsive to the prior non-final office action 1/30/2009 because the reply states, "Applicant further submits that the amendments to Claims 1, 15, 21 and 23 make express features recited in original claims 8-10 (e.g., storing position relevant Web content in a location bookmark area). These features, therefore, have been considered by the Examiner and were subject to search in the present Office Action. Hence, the Examiner's next official communication can not be made final on the basis that Applicant's amendments to the claims necessitated a new grounds of rejection requiring further consideration and/or a new search. Applicant respectfully submits that any subsequent Office Action based on new grounds of rejection must be presented as a non-Final Office Action." and the applicant also contrarily deliberately presented narrow independent claims dated 5/14/2009 over arts rejections with limitations that were not in fact present in the claims 8-10 dated 7/15/2008. See that the applicant's amended claims 15, etc., indeed contains for example, "the mobile terminal is further configured to periodically update the location bookmark in response to a relative position of the mobile terminal". At most claim 11 contains, "periodically updating the position relevant Web content" which in not what the applicant contrarily purposely presented "periodically update the location bookmark in response to a relative position of the mobile terminal", which is simply against USPTO policies and hence would be notified to the highest level for appropriate action etc., if similar occurred again, as the applicant's intentionally provided the amended claims with additional limitations that were never examined before i.e., "periodically update the location bookmark in response to a relative position of the mobile terminal", etc., along with specifically stating that "the Examiner's next official communication can not be made final on the basis that Applicant's amendments to the claims necessitated a new grounds of rejection requiring further consideration and/or a new search. Applicant respectfully submits that any subsequent Office Action based on new grounds of rejection must be presented as a non-Final Office Action.". Further, even though only limitations "periodically update the location bookmark in response to a relative position of the mobile terminal", is mentioned above; the applicant is also requested to show (in the cancelled claims 8-10 or previously rejected other claims) limitations "store the location tagged Web content in a location bookmark area of the apparatus", etc. that have been added to claim 21; and all other amended limitations that were not contained in the previously rejected claims. The applicant's presenting of the amended broadly limitations along with intentional statements for unnecessarily avoiding final office actions is contrary to the USPTO's efforts for expediting the prosecution of the case. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be bona fide, applicant is given ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

/HARESH N PATEL/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454